

North Bethany Concept Plan
DRAFT Open house #3 report
8/24/07

Introduction

Washington County hosted the third North Bethany Concept Plan open house on August 9, 2007. More than 100 people attended the open house held at Portland Community College Rock Creek Campus from 4:30 to 7:00 p.m. Open house materials and an online comment form were available on the project website from August 9 through August 19, 2007. In total, 29 people completed the comment form either on paper or online.

This third open house was one component of a comprehensive public involvement program for the North Bethany Concept Plan. To date, the process has included eleven monthly meetings with an advisory committee comprised of community representatives including residents, business owners, and developers charged with providing on-going input and advice to the Project Team and ultimately to the Board of Commissioners. A website was developed for the project and was made available to the public in September 2006. To date, fourteen small coffee discussions and community group briefings have been held to share project information and invite input from various community groups and organizations. An additional ten stakeholder interviews were held to gather input on the process and a school outreach process was initiated including an art contest for area children.

The first open house for the project was held on January 9, 2007 at Portland Community College Rock Creek; 250 people attended that event. The open house was advertised with a project kick-off postcard mailed to 1,400 addresses and an email sent to another 150 addresses. The Oregonian published a story about the first open house on January 8, 2007. Open house materials and an online comment form were also available on the project web site from January 9 through January 19, 2007. In total, 122 people completed the comment form either on paper or online.

A Design Workshop was held May 9, 2007. It included the production of a project newsletter that was mailed to 153 organizations and interested parties in the Greater Bethany area. An electronic version of the newsletter was e-mailed to an additional 372 individuals on the project's Interested Parties e-mail list. Notice of the meeting was published in the Cedar Mill News May 2007, the Skyline Ridge Runner May 2007, the CPO #7 May 2007 newsletter and the Washington County Updates May 2007. The Design Workshop was discussed in a cover story of the Oregonian Washington County Weekly on May 17, 2007, and it was also featured in a Hillsboro Argus article on April 27, 2007. An announcement of the workshop was placed in the calendar section of the Oregonian on May 10, 2007. Forty posters advertising the meeting were distributed to Bethany Village and West Union area merchants.

The August 9th Open House was publicized through a postcard mailing to 139 individuals and groups including home owner associations, churches and other organizations. An electronic version of the postcard was e-mailed to an additional 423 interested parties. Posters about the event were distributed to 40 merchants at Bethany Village and West Union Village. A meeting notice was also included in the August CPO 7 newsletter and Cedar Mill News (a publication of the Cedar Mills

Business Association). The Oregonian advertised the open house in the Calendar of Events published in the August 9, 2007 edition of the Washington County Weekly. Columnist Jerry Boone announced the open house in his column published in The Oregonian on August 1, 2007.

This report provides a summary of the input gathered through the comment form. A complete list of open-ended responses to the comment form questions is attached. Please note that the comment form was voluntary and not all attendees completed it; information from the comment form provides only an indication of community concerns and preferences.

Open house format and purpose

The meeting was designed as an open house where participants could review displays and talk with staff. Two presentations were held during the open house to provide a general overview of the draft concept plan. A comment form was the primary method for participants to provide input.

The open house was designed to:

- Share information and collect feedback on the working concept plan ideas.
- Provide updates on where we are in the concept planning process and the next steps

Participant profile

Of the 29 respondents who completed the comment form, 86% do not live or own property within the North Bethany study area, while the remaining 14% own property in the area, but do not live there. 52% of respondents (13) live within the existing Bethany community. In addition:

- 12% live in Hillsboro (3)
- 8% live in rural Washington County to the north or east of the study area (2)
- 8% live in Beaverton (2)
- 8% live in Cedar Mill (2)
- 4% live in rural Washington County to the north or west of the study area (1)
- 4% live in Aloha (1)
- 4% live in Washington County to the south of the study area (1)

39% of respondents reported living in their current home for 10 or more years, 21% said they had lived in their homes for five to nine years, and 36% said that they had lived in their homes for one to four years. Only one respondent reported living in their current home for less than one year.

Respondents reported hearing about the open house through a variety of sources:

- 29%: CPO or neighborhood newsletter (8)
- 19%: Washington County Newsletter (5)
- 19%: Email from Washington County (5)
- 19%: Word of mouth (5)
- 15%: Email from another group of individuals (4)
- 15%: The Oregonian (4)

Several respondents also noted hearing about the event through the Beaverton Valley Times, an invitation from the Bethany Library, and unspecified internet sources.

Most respondents (68%) said that they had attended North Bethany meetings in the past. 29% said that the meeting was their first, and one respondent indicated that they had only participated online.

Participant profile responses were similar to those at the second open house, though respondents at the second open house indicated that they had lived in the area longer (60% had lived in the area 10+ years) and more had reported hearing about the event through the Oregonian (45%) and CPO newsletters (37%).

Draft Concept Plan

Parks and Trails

38% of respondents felt that the parks shown on the Parks and Trails plan were definitely appropriate for the community and 63% felt they were somewhat appropriate. 46% of respondents felt that the trail network was definitely appropriate, and 54% felt it was somewhat appropriate. No respondents indicated that the parks and trails plan was inappropriate, though there were several suggestions for design improvements:

- Trails and trail users should not disturb natural areas.
- Different trails should be used for cyclists and pedestrians
- Trails should be paved and augment existing bike lanes.
- The existing bridge at the Arbor Oaks development is concerning.
- Each park should be sized for baseball and other sports.
- A dog park should be provided.
- A safe crossing across Springville Road should be available.
- Washroom facilities should be available.

Transportation – Streets

Most respondents felt that the major streets shown in the draft concept Street Framework plan were either definitely (30%) or somewhat (45%) appropriate. 25% felt that the plan was not quite or not at all appropriate. Some respondents recommended using more one way streets in the design and several others were concerned about the potential for increased traffic on lower Bethany Blvd., Kaiser Rd., and other roads with access to Hwy 26. Other recommendations included:

- Not building five-lane capacity for Road A if it isn't necessary for internal traffic.
- Not planning as if the UGB will expand eastward.
- Leaving Bethany Blvd. from West Union to Keizer as is.
- Providing a quicker route out of the area.
- Lowering the road near the crest and constructing pedestrian bridge to cross road.
- Improving Springville Road first.
- Providing more walking options.
- Providing more north/south connections.
- Considering a road north of PCC that connects 185th to Road C.
- Considering how Road E south of Brugger Road to Springville is a blind intersection and surrounds a school.

Three respondents (21%) supported removing the southern segment of Road E. Four respondents (29%) indicated that it should be retained. The largest group of respondents (50%) offered new ideas. Two suggested creating a connection through the PCC campus. Others included:

- Continuing Road C to 185th.
- Making access right-in, right-out.
- Aligning Road E with the road on the south, providing a traffic light, and moving the bend in the road away from the intersection.

Seven respondents (44%) felt that the western portion of Road A should be situated further towards the edges of the neighborhoods. Six respondents (38%) felt that the road should remain where it is currently on the concept map. Other suggestions included:

- Not planning for a 5-lane boulevard unless warranted by internal traffic.
- Making the road straight or curve in only one direction.
- Planning for many smaller roads instead of fewer larger ones.
- Considering noise abatement strategies.

Three respondents (14%) indicated that the map and list of transportation improvements is definitely adequate for addressing future needs and seven (33%) felt it was somewhat adequate. Six (29%) felt the map and list were not quite adequate, while five (24%) felt it was not at all adequate. In terms of recommended improvements, the most common recommendation involved facilitating connections to bus, light rail, or other transit. Others included:

- Improving the Kaiser Rd. and Bethany Blvd. connections to Hwy 26.
- Providing north-south access to freeway.
- Considering how 185th will support additional traffic.
- Providing a traffic corridor at the east end.
- Improving safety conditions for cyclists before expanding traffic/roadways.
- Building roads and infrastructure first.
- Considering how unzoned property lowers values.

Neighborhoods and Centers

A majority of respondents felt that the community center and nodes portion of the plan was definitely appropriate for the new community (61%). 28% felt that the plan was somewhat appropriate, and only two individuals (11%) felt that the plan was not quite or not at all appropriate.

There were several suggestions recommending access to small grocery stores at each node. Other suggestions included:

- Including a Starbucks on every corner.
- Moving the community center closer to PCC.
- Increasing density at each node to better support a variety of useful services.

One-third of respondents felt that the Kaiser Road Couplet, as shown on the conceptual design, definitely achieves objectives regarding the walkability, design, and safety for the community center on Kaiser Road. One-third felt that the couplet somewhat achieves the objectives, and one third felt that the couplet does not quite achieve the objectives. Suggestions for enhancing walkability, design, and pedestrian safety included:

- Using landscaping as a buffer between pedestrians and traffic.
- Avoiding bottlenecks at Kaiser or allowing through-traffic to bypass the community center.
- Providing a separate lane for cyclists and a separate trail for pedestrians.
- Providing pedestrian and bicycle amenities.
- Using two-way roads instead of a couplet.
- Including more high-density housing next to the park blocks.

Stormwater and Water Quality

Most respondents felt that the concept plan is definitely on track (69%) or somewhat on track (19%) towards achieving green infrastructure principles and practices. Two people felt that the concept plan was not quite or not at all on track. One respondent noted that he/she liked the idea of creating a natural, rural feel that supports wildlife and outdoor living among residents. Other comments included:

- Concerns about flooding/creek issues in existing Bethany.
- Concerns about Arbor Homes and property lines.
- Recommendations that water be collected in grey-water systems.

Affordable Housing

Thirty-nine percent of respondents definitely supported the principles and goals regarding variety and affordability in housing. 33% were somewhat supportive, 6% were not quite supportive, and 22% were not at all supportive. There were several comments that raised questions about how affordable housing works and what the benefits would be. Some respondents were generally skeptical of whether affordable housing could work in the area. Other comments noted that:

- Access to jobs and transit should be a component of affordable housing.
- There is a need for retirement housing.
- New housing developments are not needed at this time.

Other Comments

The general comments varied but were generally focused on specific amenities, density issues, and funding. There were a number of comments that expressed concern over impacts to the surrounding area.

One comment suggested that there would be demand for even higher density development, while another respondent said they were opposed to the development of the area because the demand isn't high enough and any development would place a burden on existing services. Other respondents were also apprehensive about potential impacts to existing Bethany, with one respondent encouraging careful consideration of the transportation and livability needs outside of the study area. One respondent expressed the hope that any high density developments would look and feel "good." One person suggested building roads before the houses.

There were also questions about where funding will come from, with one person expressing concern at the costs to ratepayers outside of the area. There was a suggestion to use urban renewal as a source of funding. Another respondent living to the north of the study area suggested considering cooperative land deals that could benefit all parties involved.

There were a number of specific requests and questions about specific amenities, including:

- Dark-sky friendly street lighting.
- Bicycle friendly trails.
- Facilities for performances in parks.
- A community reservoir.
- A community shuttle to access MAX or other areas of interest
- A rainwater catchment system for irrigating parks.
- The availability of middle and high schools.

One respondent questioned whether the “Portland” address designation will change.

Full Text of Responses

What design improvements, if any, would you suggest for the Park and Trails plan?

1. Some segments of the northern-most trails appear to be fairly close to Abbey Creek itself. I do not think it would be good for people, their bikes & dogs, to be given easy access the natural areas of Abbey Creek because of possible disturbance to wildlife. Perhaps the trails could be built with this in mind.
2. Concerned about bridge already built in the “grandfathered” development (Arbor Oaks?) on the planned trail
3. Pedestrians and cyclists have different needs, and should have different path/trails
4. Need to study
5. Make sure there are plenty of pedestrian walkways, bicycle paths between parks, public spaces and out to residents
6. It would be nice if each park was big enough for a pickup baseball game (this makes it big enough for football, soccer, etc) also basketball court in the corner-probably picnic tables, etc.
7. Addition of a dog park
8. Please have a safe crossing (across Springville) from the southern powerline trail to the northern trail.
9. Please have adequate “washroom” facility for young children using the park
10. Trails should be used to augment bike lines on roads, not substitutes, and they need to be paved so they can be used when it rains.

What improvements, if any, would you suggest for the Street Framework plan?

1. I wonder at the necessity of providing Road A with five-lane capacity. Is this necessary for internal traffic at build-out? Perhaps so. However, if the intent is to provide movement through North Bethany for through traffic (vehicles whose origin or destination is not N. Bethany), I do not think it should be done. Also, and in particular, North Bethany should not be planned for UGB expansions to the east. We are working to ensure that Multnomah County will maintain the rural character of the lands that border the eastern boundary of N. Bethany, so to anticipate traffic from the east has the effect of encouraging something that Multnomah County does not foresee and does not want. This area will very likely become one of the areas subject to agreement between Metro and Multnomah County for inclusion into a Rural Reserve under the provisions of SB 1011. Also, for this reason, it makes little sense to include within the plan the stub road extending from the roundabout that ends abruptly at the Multnomah County line. There will not be a road to connect to.
2. What about present Bethany Blvd. - if enlarged it would divide the present Bethany community. Leave Bethany Blvd. from West Union to Kaiser as it is!
3. More single direction streets, which require less land to be built, and make a more efficient transport flow.

4. It's fine as far as the defined scope. The problems will occur with additional traffic through existing roads to Rte 26 and points south. Travel can already be frustrating at peak times.
5. Need a route out of the area. The streets are grid locked now. Local streets should feed to through streets which should feed to highways, it is now very difficult to get anywhere and it will only get worse.
6. Do not like Kaiser Road couplet. Consider lowering road near crest and putting pedestrian bridge over it. The road should be lowered not the bridge raised.
7. 1st Springville road needs to be improved the entire length
8. Would like more "walking" options!
9. More north/south connections need to be created! Moving the increased traffic north/south with only 2 traffic corridors is completely inadequate. More over, it is irresponsible.
10. Lower Bethany Blvd cannot handle all the "through" traffic this plan will dump onto it. It's already impossible to turn left for huge blocks of time during the day. You've made Bethany the straightest shot to the freeway. The presenter totally blew me off when I asked him - most people will drive off the 'wrong' way to get to 185th and then he walked away. This is totally naive-to assume just since 'projected growth' is west in Hillsboro, no one moving in will go east or to Nike, etc. and use Bethany (since it is a major road in the plan) to get there. The road is already a problem and even 5-lane is not committed to be built
11. I oppose Road E south of Brugger Rd to Springville-it is a blind intersection, it surrounds the school with cars on all sides. Can a road be built just north of PCC Rock Creek that connects 185th to Road C. Central North Bethany? It would alleviate commuter traffic on Springville, provide another entrance to PCC Rock Creek and would be good planning for the next UGB expansion
12. I don't think Kaiser can handle all of the planned traffic; the only five lane road planned won't connect to it.
13. Instead of planning on allowing 5 lanes in the future, layout the road network to allow for two three lane roads side by side or two two-lane, one-way, roads side by side.

Alternative considerations if the southern segment of Road E is removed from the plan because the intersection proves not feasible.

1. Couldn't the road feed into the current exit from PCC campus? Of course the PCC road would need extensive modifications and improvements.
2. Somehow connect through the PCC campus.
3. Continue road C out to 185th since most users of E to Springfield would be headed that way anyway.
4. This is a very dangerous section of road and visibility off an intersection here would be limited. We don't need more cars leaving the road
 - Road should align with road on south side
 - Assume this will get a traffic light
 - Could bend it 100-200 feet north of intersection. Non-aligned roads have proven to be disasters, Saltzman/Thompson intersection for example. This looks to be heavily traveled.

May want to reserve width. High tech (Intel, etc) to/from community. Back way from Kaiser/Springville to 185th/Cornelius Pass

5. Make whatever accommodations are necessary to provide these traffic corridors.
6. Make it RIRO if that works better.

For this community, the alignment of a boulevard-like Road A should:

1. Do not plan for a 5-lane boulevard unless warranted by internal traffic projections at build-out.
2. Make it straight or only (allergic to s-shaped roads like Kaiser and Germantown) curve one way. Consider noise abatement (trees, road slightly lower, space)
3. Plan for multiple smaller roads instead of fewer large ones. 25 years isn't long term anyway - what will it be in 50-100 years, a 10 lane freeway? Maybe you should figure out ways to get less people to drive.

If not, what single additional improvement would you consider most crucial?

1. The Kaiser/Bethany Blvd connection to Hwy 26 needs to be much improved before North Bethany is built. This includes better freeway access as well as widening the entire length of Bethany Blvd / Kaiser Rd to North Bethany, with synchronization of the traffic lights. It is becoming a major hassle to access Hwy 26 from the study area even now. Think what it will be like when North Bethany is built!
2. What about private transit NOW! Where are they in the planning process
3. Plan for light rail now, so it could be added easily, and would not be a difficult decision
4. No white zone or unzoned property lowers existing value
5. Within give scope. problems will be outside the acre area
6. Tri-Met needs to consider smaller shuttle buses to MAX stations. especially to Sunset Transit Center
7. Roads and infrastructure should be built first. You are putting the cart before the horse.
8. Feed easy bus path from town center to PCC to encourage bus folks to reroute slightly
9. I'm concerned about how 185th will support the additional traffic. Also, the on ramps onto HWY 26 are already backed up. Are you considering the "bigger picture"?
10. A traffic corridor must be provided at the east end of the project area. A connection to Saltzman Rd (Murray Rd, or NW 143rd needs to be found
11. North-south access to the freeway, unless everyone's going to work at home.
12. Many urban and rural roads in Washington County are very unsafe for cyclists and pedestrians due to traffic and/or lack of bike lanes, shoulders, sidewalks or streetlights. Adding *any* more auto traffic or encouraging auto traffic by widening roads, without improving these unsafe conditions first, is absolutely irresponsible. The most crucial improvement is to provide basic safety along any roads which will have new North Bethany traffic from North Bethany.

What suggestions, if any, do you think would improve the Community Center and Nodes plan?

1. Provide more local stores rather than a large grocery store in the middle, allow residents to walk to a convenience store
2. An interesting idea is to have family/quick marts at nodes: want bread, milk, eggs and some other staples no alcohol sales. Maybe cigarettes. Dads could stop at store on way home, kids could be sent for staples. Not real grocery store. If needed in “town center” not clear to me if QFC is close enough
3. A Starbucks on every corner
4. The community center should be closer to PCC. I see students living in apartments, but they should be closer to campus.
5. The density in all nodes needs to be increased in light of the following facts:
 The current density, something like 5.75 units per gross acre, is not nearly enough to support frequent service transit to the places most people will want to go - Sunset TC, Willow Creek TC, Hillsboro, Beaverton, and Portland. (Why do we spend hundreds of millions to decrease drive times but not bump up density to decrease transit wait times?)
 The current density will allow the County to provide housing for a sliver of the expected incoming population over the next 25 years (let alone the population we can assume will come in the next century). In fact at this low density, we'll have to bring in something like 20 more North Bethanys into the UGB to house everyone. Using low rise condos we could build at over 100 units/acre - so only 4 North Bethanys need to be built to support all population growth for 25 years.
 The current density is not enough to support enough businesses in the area so people don't have to drive far away often. It should be dense enough to support:
 - grocery stores
 - medical offices
 - theatres
 - restaurants
 - clothing shops
 - bike shops
 to name a few. Cities in Europe and some college towns in the US are dense enough to support these things and the result is more people walking/biking than driving.

What improvements, if any, would you suggest to enhance the walkability, design, and pedestrian safety of the Community Center on Kaiser Road?

1. I can't tell from the map, but am hoping that the sidewalk areas in the NBP in general will include landscaping along the street, giving pedestrians a buffer between them and passing traffic.
2. This Kaiser Road area bothers me a little from the standpoint of through traffic. Can it be designed to allow for smooth movement of traffic through the area adjacent to the commercial center? It looks like you may be creating a bottleneck which ever way you design it (couplet or no couplet), as well as a pedestrian hazard. Rather than have such intimate proximity, would it not be possible to allow Kaiser through traffic to bypass the community center area?
3. Provide a separate lane for cyclists and a trail away from the road for pedestrians
4. Pedestrian areas-yes a plaza, bicycle parking

5. see answer at 10
6. NIC
7. I prefer a two-way road as opposed to a one-way couplet
8. Have more than one or two blocks of “high density” housing (whatever that means - the illustration doesn't say) north and south of the park blocks. All buildings along the park blocks should be mixed use, so you could have shops along the park blocks and go eat in the park.

What improvements, if any, do you think would achieve the objectives?

1. I like the plan in that it will give the area a more natural, rural feel than the sterile feeling you get in a more traditional neighborhood water plan. The new plan will attract and support wildlife and encourage a greater degree of outdoor living among the residents.
2. Still concerned about flooding of present Bethany with disruption of vegetation and construction of houses.
3. The problem will be in the execution-Arbor homes created a big mess on the south side of Springville Rd and paid no attention to property lines.
4. I talked to several folks about issues with where creek shown on northeast section actually flows to Abbey Creek
5. Developers should be required to use LIDA. All homes/buildings should be LEED and/or Earth Advantage certified. Water should be collected and used in gray water systems.

What additional tools, if any, would you suggest for achieving these project principles?

1. I do not believe a development of new housing is needed in the area at this time.
2. If just seems impassable with the pride of the land
3. The need is for retirement housing
4. We eliminate trailer parks where people own their own home and give tax incentives to build affordable housing. I don't understand the benefits.
5. I just do not see how this can work, if you build a community of distinction, the price for even the least of the housing is going to be bid up. Are you going to write councils on the property such that the first buyer must be poor and can only sell to some other poor person?
6. This area is much too expensive to develop to try affordable housing
7. It seems really odd to not have enough money to provide the necessary infrastructure, but then work hard to provide low cost, new housing that is far from employers and has no public transportation.
8. Part of affordable housing is affordable and efficient transportation. All homes should be w/in 1/4 mile of frequent service transit, and every attempt should be made to encourage non-auto modes.

Also, people should not be required to pay for cars. Specifically, they shouldn't have to pay for a parking space if they don't have a car, and they shouldn't have to help pay for the millions of

dollars of road widening projects if they don't drive. Gas tax and vehicle registration or car sales tax (amount of tax based on cost of car) should be used to pay for road projects.

Tax things you want less of, like driving, and subsidize things you want more of, like housing and transit.

Other Comments

1. I am opposed to the development of North Bethany. It will be a burden on water and sewer, school district, emergency and fire services, and especially an additional load on traffic. Housing demand is not as high as it once was, and plenty of existing homes are not getting sold.
2. Kudos for your good work! Small complaint: It would be nice to design your surveys in such a manner that the entire survey could be printed out, including our long-winded comments that don't fit in these little boxes. Thanks.
3. Great job but still apprehensive about the impact on the present Bethany...it presently is a wonderful place to live!
4. Concerned about design of homes. Shrinking trad. American tract home design to fit higher density looks and feels awful. Take lessons from Japan and Europe on how to make higher density housing that works!
5. Our legislature recently passed a bill to have the lighting standards re-written to require dark-sky friendly lighting. Please require such lighting for north Bethany now, Many of the adjacent developments have dark sky friendly light and we like our stars!
6. Will the trails be cyclist friendly? Will the community park have a big outdoor stage for "music in the park" or similar events? Will the area continue to be a "Portland" address even though it is Washington County, or will it eventually become a new town by the name of Bethany (in the foreseeable future). Will there be a community water reservoir? Will there be rain water catchment and grey water systems installed to irrigate community parks, trees and vegetation? Will there be a community "shuttle express" to the Max Station (or other center of importance)
7. Where will the money come from? Will all of Washington County tax payers have to be taxed? I'm concerned with the cost to the tax payers that don't live in the 800 acre North Bethany area. Project of this size was started and it seems they run out of money. Hopefully urban wall won't be used
8. Two issues: 1) we own land contiguous with about 1200' of your northern boundary. (but in Multnomah County and currently outside UGB) You may want to talk to us about issues near the boundary, we are pretty plenty (normally!) 2) Need to be track Metro's acquisition of land south of Germantown east of 185th. 2a) Coordinate with purchases, efforts, etc 2b) Current owners may be more cooperative than county if something good for them if you can be done. Example: some of our land could be used as park or trail to complement what you are doing. Or in general: the upper part of the south side of Abbey Creek could be used as a trail and could expand some of your parks if they were placed near your northern border.
9. The plan supports new elementary schools. However, there is not a plan for a middle school or high school. The high school in the area is already over crowded and would not support the additional growth. Where would the funding for the new schools come from?

10. I'm very disappointed in the lack of roads in the entire Bethany area-Roads need to go in first before houses are built.
11. The most wonderful neighborhood will not succeed if residents can't get in or out of it, the planning for transportation needs outside the immediate area has been entirely adequate. In addition, expecting one area of existing neighborhoods (along Bethany Blvd) to absorb the most significant portion of the traffic is a disservice to all those long time (tax paying) citizens. We also deserve to have planners consider the livability of existing neighborhoods as well as this new one.
12. I am in favor of the urban renewal idea as a source for funding of North Bethany. Thanks to all who have been participating in discussions on North Bethany, it looks great!
13. An excerpt from <http://vagabondshark.wordpress.com/2007/08/13/problems-with-urban-renewal-in-north-bethany/>

Washington County planners say they can't do higher density development because they don't think the market will support it, yet have they done any studies or read anything that verifies that, or are they just guessing? Consider this:

Married couples with children make up only 23% of the housing market, according to the 2003 US Census. Everything I've read indicates that more and more people don't need or want detached houses with private yards. Personally I've lived in low and higher density developments in Washington County, and I'd easily trade a small yard for a nice park at the end of the street. I suspect the reason developers like building detached houses is because they can use a "one size fits all" philosophy and cookie cutter development to save their design and architecture costs, instead of spending time figuring out what the community really wants, like parks, pools, or community gardens.

However, even if the whole development were done using detached houses, according to the University of Minnesota Metropolitan Design Center the density could be up to 15 units / acre (see their Housing Types Sheet [PDF]).